

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/491,429	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HEANUE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ARMANDO RODRIGUEZ	<b>Art Unit</b> 2828	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) ARMANDO RODRIGUEZ. (3) John H. Jerman.  
 (2) Edward n. Bachand. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 09 August 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,13 and 16.

Identification of prior art discussed: McIntyre (PN 5,319,257).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed proposed claim language to better define and clarify the claimed invention. The proposed claim language would better define the critical dimension of the actuator, as being in the micron dimension. Applicant also agreed to explicitly define the term "micro-machined" as is known to those skilled in the art and to provide with the written submission an exhibit, which compares the actual size of the claimed actuator with a similar actuator described in the cited prior art of McIntyre. Applicant was advised by the examiner that upon receipt of the pending written submission, such written submission will be subject to further review and to an updated search.